

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,543	10/06/2003	Sung-Chul Shin	03-628	3304
34704	7590 11/13/2006		EXAMINER	
BACHMAN & LAPOINTE, P.C. 900 CHAPEL STREET			RICKMAN, HOLLY C	
SUITE 1201	LSIREEI		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW HAVE	N, CT 06510		1773	
·			DATE MAILED: 11/13/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/679,543	SHIN ET AL.			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Holly Rickman	1773	:		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe			ross		
THE REPLY FILED 27 October 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A		·			
1.   The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of					
this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)		
<ul> <li>a)  The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date</li> <li>b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A</li> </ul>	-	in the final rejection, whi	ichover is later. In		
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7		FIRST REPLY WAS F	ILED WITHIN		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as		
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since					
a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	within the time period set forth in 3	77 CFR 41.37(a).			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	nsideration and/or search (see NO	TE below);			
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).		
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all</li> </ul>		timely filed amondme	ent concoling the		
non-allowable claim(s).	nowabie ii submitted iii a separate,	unlery med amendme	in canceling the		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	•				
<ul> <li>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> <li>8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	Is to provide a I).		
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ied.		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

see attachment.

13. Other: \_\_\_\_.

11. 🖾 The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).

## ADVISORY ACTION (continued)

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Christodoulides et al. does not disclose the claimed volume percent of carbon. In addition, Applicant maintains that Christodoulides et al. disclose a multi-layer thin film including FePt and carbon that is different in structure and properties from the claimed invention.

The examiner acknowledges the fact that Christodoulides does not disclose the claimed volume percentage of carbon. However, the rejection is not based on 102 but rather 35 USC 103. Thus, the issue is one of obviousness. The examiner maintains the position that a prima facie case of obviousness has been set forth.

With regard to structural and property distinctions between claim 1 and Christodoulides as well as the particular method of making used by Christodoulides, the examiner contends that the only feature of claim 1 not explicitly met by the reference is the volume percentage of carbon, noted above. Structural features and properties noted by Applicant's including noise, grain size, coercivity and grain size distribution are not particularly limited by claim 1.

Applicant further argues that "claim 1 sets forth a high density magnetic recording medium that exhibits both the desired microstructure and magnetic property." However, as previously noted by the examiner, there is not probative evidence establishing the unexpectedness of the claimed carbon volume percentage.

Art Unit: 1773

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Holly Rickman whose telephone number is (571) 272-1514. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney can be reached on (571) 272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Holly Rickman Primary Examiner Art Unit 1773